

The Aryan Invasion Theory: The Final Nail in its Coffin

(From a Chapter in "Advancements of Ancient India's Vedic Culture")
by Stephen Knapp

The Aryan Invasion Theory (AIT) is the idea that the Vedic people were not indigenous to the area of northern India, but were invaders from the Caucasus Mountain region that descended on India around 1500 BCE, and then wrote the Vedic literature and forced the natives to accept their culture. In writing this chapter I want to emphasize that this book is not about the Aryan Invasion Theory (AIT), but we should at least include one chapter on it to show its place in discovering the real history of the development of ancient India and the origins of Vedic culture. In doing so, I acknowledge there have already been volumes written on this controversial topic, and on where the original homeland of the Indo Aryans might be. So anyone can read any of those books until one is nauseated with various viewpoints, but that is not what we are going to do here. Going into a long dissertation about how all the theories were developed and what evidence they found is the last thing I want to do. For all but the specialist researchers and readers, it would make for an extremely tedious book, at least more so than some may feel it is already. So, we are only going to summarize some of the most recent and concluding research that is available today.

Let us remember that the idea that the Vedic Aryans came from outside of ancient India and entered the region to start what became the Vedic civilization is a foreign idea. There was never any record, either historical, textual or archeological, that supports this premise for an Aryan invasion. There also is no record of who would have been the invaders. The fact is that it is a theory that came from mere linguistic speculation which happened during the nineteenth century when very little archeological excavation had yet been done around India.

There have been many researchers who have tried to study the linguistics of the people to gather an indication of where the original homeland of the Vedic Aryans was actually located. This was done to either try to uphold or refute the idea of the Aryan Invasion Theory. In my book, *Proof of Vedic Culture's Global Existence*, I dealt with linguistics and word similarities to a degree, but this topic, in spite of all the research, study, and books written on whatever findings were made, has done little to absolutely establish with clarity the original home of the Vedic Aryans.

Some scholars have always felt that the linguistic evidence is not sufficient to draw definite conclusions where the homeland of the Vedic Aryans was located.

Linguistics amongst some scholars have always been a speculative process, at best arriving at various conjectures about the origins of particular cultures and languages. Others have been even more dismissive of the idea of reconstructing a hypothetical language based on words that remain present in spoken languages thousands of years later. Thus, in trying to understand the Vedic Aryans and where their homeland may have been by analyzing some hypothetical Proto-Indo-European language that still has not been identified seems rather doubtful. At best, it may provide some basic hypothesis, which in reality may be most misleading. This also seems to say that there is little reason to hold the field of linguistics in such a high degree of respect, considering all the books that have been written that seem to use this process to determine so many conclusions, or conjectures, on the homeland of the Vedic Aryans.

As a further comment to this issue, G. P. Singh relates, "They (proponents of the Aryan Invasion Theory) are divided in their opinion regarding the exact location of the said common home, the reason for which is not far to discover. The speakers of Aryan languages have been clubbed together as an Aryan race which never existed as such. The philological and ethnological explanations regarding the identification of an Aryan language with an Aryan race are conflicting. The similarities of a few words do not necessarily constitute a proof of common origin of their speakers, rather they indicate commingling and sociocultural contacts and fellowship. The theory of a common home of members of a so-called Aryan family whether in Asia or Europe cannot be accepted merely on the evidence of linguistic paleontology... The Aryan invasion of India is a myth and not the truth. The Aryans were neither invaders nor conquerors. They were not the destroyers of the Harappan civilization but one of its authors."¹

This does not mean, however, that we cannot still use linguistics to help recognize the many similarities of cultures by the closeness of words, in both spelling and meaning, that are used in the languages of various traditions, or where and how far the Vedic and Sanskrit influence has traveled, and how various cultures may have shared traditions with each other. But to supply proof of where the Vedic people originated, that is not possible. Plus, today we have so much more research and archeological evidence that tells far more than the study of linguistics, which will certainly lead us to the correct conclusion about this matter.

Up till today, there is still no culture from the time of ancient India that can be said to have originated outside and then invaded or brought the Vedic

culture to the interior of India. More evidence will be given as we discuss this topic. But for now, what this means is that if we look at the ancient ruins, or agricultural practices, artifacts, or social activities, it can be recognized that they were all based on indigenous techniques and traditions. They are not linked to anything that would have come from outside of India, although just the opposite is the case. Moreover, we can see a migration from India to the west or even eastward.

Traditionally, as we find in the *Manu-samhita* (2.17-18), Vedic culture was founded by the sage Manu between the banks of the Sarasvati and Drishadvati Rivers. And the Sarasvati River was the main river in the *Rig Veda*, which, according to modern land studies, was a massive and important river at the time (before 1900 BCE). Only after this did the emphasis shift to the sacred Ganga (Ganges) River. This would indicate that the Vedic tradition is indeed a product of the area of ancient India.

There was also no real divide between north and south India in terms of the so-called invading Aryans in the north and the Dravidians of the south. As explained by David Frawley, "Dravidian history does not contradict Vedic history either. It credits the invention of the Tamil language, the oldest Dravidian tongue, to the rishi Agastya, one of the most prominent sages in the *Rig Veda*. Dravidian kings historically have called themselves Aryans and trace their descent through Manu (who in the *Matsya Purana* is regarded as originally a south Indian king). Apart from language, moreover, both north and south India share a common religion and culture."²

A recent landmark global study in population genetics by a team of internationally reputed scientists (as reported in *The History and Geography of Human Genes*, by Luca Cavalli-Sforza, Paolo Menozzi and Alberta Piazzo, Princeton University Press) reveals that the people who inhabited the Indian subcontinent, including Europe, concludes that all belong to one single race of Caucasian type. This confirms once again that there really is no racial difference between north Indians and south Indian Dravidians.

Other scholars and researchers are also giving up the idea of the Aryan Invasion Theory. As further explained in the book *Origin of Indian Civilization*, based on the results of the conference of the same name, it was described that, "While not in complete agreement, yet for Professor Witzel and Eltsov to acknowledge that the Harappan and Vedic civilizations were concurrent, is an important landmark in the debate on the Indic civilization. Prof. Witzel also stated for the first time to many in the audience that he and his colleagues no longer subscribe to the Aryan Invasion Theory (AIT). Prof. Witzel of Harvard agreed with the scholars present that the Aryan invasion theory is a nineteenth-century concept and a spent force today. He said, 'nobody in the right mind believes in something like Aryan Invasion Theory.'"³

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ARYAN INVASION THEORY

Before the 1857 uprising it was recognized that British rule in India could not be sustained without a large number of supporters and collaborators from within the Indian population. Recognizing this, it was influential men like Thomas Babington Macaulay, who, as Chairman of the Education Board, sought to set up an educational system modeled after the British system, which, in the case of India, would serve to undermine the Hindu tradition. While not a missionary himself, Macaulay came from a deeply religious family steeped in the Protestant Christian faith. His father was a Presbyterian minister and his mother a Quaker. He believed that the conversion of Hindus to Christianity held the answer to the problems of administering India. His idea was to create a class of English educated elite that would repudiate its tradition and become British collaborators. In 1836, while serving as chairman of the Education Board in India, he enthusiastically wrote his father about his idea and how it was proceeding:

"Our English schools are flourishing wonderfully. The effect of this education on the Hindus is prodigious... It is my belief that if our plans of education are followed up, there will not be a single idolator among the respectable classes in Bengal thirty years hence. And this will be effected without any efforts to proselytise, without the smallest interference with religious liberty, by natural operation of knowledge and reflection. I heartily rejoice in the project."

So the point was that religious conversion and colonialism were to go hand in hand. European Christian missions were an appendage of the colonial government, with missionaries working side by side with the government. In this case, we could ask if over the years much has really changed in the purpose of the Christian missions in India.

The key point here is Macaulay's belief that "knowledge and reflection" on the part of the Hindus, especially the Brahmanas, would cause them to give up their age-old belief in anything Vedic in favor of Christianity. The purpose was to turn the strength of Hindu intellectuals against their own kind by utilizing their commitment to scholarship in uprooting their own tradition, which Macaulay viewed as nothing more than superstitions. His plan was to educate the Hindus to become Christians and turn them into collaborators. He persisted with this idea for fifteen years until he found the money and the right man for turning his utopian idea into reality.

He needed someone who would translate and interpret the Vedic texts in such a way that the newly educated Indian elite would see the superiority of the Bible and choose that over everything else. Upon his return to England,

after a good deal of effort he found a talented but impoverished young German Vedic scholar by name Friedrich Max Muller who was willing to take on the arduous job. Macaulay used his influence with the East India Company to find funds for Max Muller's translation of the *Rig Veda*. Though an ardent German nationalist, Max Muller agreed for the sake of Christianity to work for the East India Company, which in reality meant the British Government of India. He also badly needed a major sponsor for his ambitious plans, which he felt he had at last found.

The fact is that Max Muller was paid by the East India Company to further its colonial aims, and worked in cooperation with others who were motivated by the superiority of the German race through the white Aryan race theory.

This was the genesis of his great enterprise, translating the *Rig Veda* with Sayana's commentary and the editing of the fifty-volume *Sacred Books of the East*. In this way, there can be no doubt regarding Max Muller's initial aim and commitment to converting Indians to Christianity. Writing to his wife in 1866 he observed:

"It [the *Rig Veda*] is the root of their religion and to show them what the root is, I feel sure, is the only way of uprooting all that has sprung from it during the last three thousand years."

Two years later he also wrote the Duke of Argyle, then acting Secretary of State for India: "The ancient religion of India is doomed. And if Christianity does not take its place, whose fault will it be?" This makes it very clear that Max Muller was an agent of the British government paid to advance its colonial interests. Nonetheless, he still remained an ardent German nationalist even while working in England. This helps explain why he used his position as a recognized Vedic and Sanskrit scholar to promote the idea of the "Aryan race" and the "Aryan nation," a theory amongst a certain class of so-called scholars, which has maintained its influence even until today.

MAX MULLER DENIES HIS OWN THEORY

It was in the nineteenth century when Max Muller tried to date the *Vedas* to 1200 BCE. Then he accepted the *Sutra* literature to the sixth century BCE and assigned a duration of just 200 years to each of the periods of Vedic literature, namely the *Aranyakas*, *Brahmanas* and *Vedas*. But when his contemporary scholars, like Goldstucker, Whitney and Wilson, raised a fuss about this, he had to regress and stated (in his Preface to the *Rgveda*): "I have repeatedly dwelt on the merely hypothetical character of the dates, which I have ventured to assign to the first periods of Vedic literature. All I have claimed for them has been that they are minimum dates, and that the

literary productions of each period which either still exist or which formerly existed could hardly be accounted for within shorter limits of time than those suggested."⁴

This indicates his admission that he really did not know and he was expressing nothing but conjecture. This is not exactly a scholarly action. But still being pressed by his contemporaries, he finally admitted it in a publication in 1890 (*Physical Religion*) and reflected the responsibility by saying no one can figure it out: "If now we ask how we can fix the dates of these periods, it is quite clear that we cannot hope to fix *aterminum a qua*. Whether the Vedic hymns were composed [in] 1000 or 1500 or 2000 or 3000 BC, no power on earth will ever determine."⁵

Although Max Muller was the one who cleverly came up with the Aryan Invasion Theory, he later worked to bring out the *Sacred Books of the East* series, which helped promote the spiritual wisdom of the East to the general public in Europe. Later, though a German by birth, he was living comfortably in England when in 1872, after the German nationalists finally achieved unification, he marched into a university in German occupied France (Strasbourg) and denounced the German doctrine of the superior Aryan race. It was at this time that he began to clarify that by Aryan he meant language and not a race. This was in stark contrast with his previous views, which had all been well documented, and which kept following him since politicians and propagandists kept using his conclusions as authority for their own race ideas. At last, he stated clearly in 1888:

"I have declared again and again that if I say Aryan, I mean neither blood nor bones, nor skull nor hair; I mean simply those who speak the Aryan language... To me an ethnologist who speaks of Aryan blood, Aryan race, Aryan eyes and hair is as great a sinner as a linguist who speaks of a dolicocephalic dictionary or of brachycephalic grammar."⁶

Just as he had previously been a proponent of the Aryan race theory for the first 20 years of his life, he remained an opponent of it for the remaining 30 years of his life. However, in spite of this fact, we still find Indian scholars who still hold onto Muller's previous views, however inaccurate they may have been, in their own conclusions on India's history.

THE DAMAGE DONE BY THE ARYAN INVASION THEORY

The premise of the Aryan Invasion Theory (AIT) was used as a perfect tool, especially by the British, to divide the Hindu society and the state of India. The North Indian "Aryans" were then pit against the South Indian "Dravidians," along with high-caste against low-caste, mainstream Hindus against tribals, Vedic orthodoxy against the indigenous orthodox sects, and

later to neutralize Hindu criticism of the forced Islamic occupation of India, since "Hindus themselves entered India in the same way as Muslims did." Even today, the theory has still been used as the basis for the growth of secularist and even Marxist forces.

The problem with all of this is that people of Indian descent, especially the youth, when they hear all of this Aryan Invasion theory nonsense, they begin to lose faith in their own country, culture and history, and especially in the Vedic tradition and epics. They think it is all just stories, fiction, or even a lie. But that is not the case at all, which is why it is important to show where this theory came from, what its purpose was, and why we should throw it away and take a second and much deeper look at what the Vedic tradition has to offer, and how it was actually the source of much of the world's advancement in so many areas.

Even in India today it is often the case that schools teach the Western views of Indian history and even use European translations of the great Vedic texts. Children are taught that their culture is inherently inferior to the Western developments, and that Hinduism is archaic, outdated, with nothing to offer people today. Therefore, in this view, Indian students should no longer value their own culture and instead look toward the West for everything they need. But this notion is absolutely false. They do not know how much the Western youth looks toward India for its spiritual inspiration, and are using the ancient Indian and Vedic traditions, such as yoga, Jyotish, Vastu, Ayurveda, and the Vedic philosophy to reach their highest potential and well-being. They would not do that if they were not experiencing the benefits of it. In fact, it is all becoming increasingly popular because there is more curiosity, inquiry, and need to find something of substance rather than being content with the shallow nature of Western society and its values.

Part of the problem today is in the educational system of India, and everywhere for that matter, that still often projects the idea that the native Indians were undeveloped and pushed out of the area that was taken over by the invading Aryans, who then pushed their language, culture, and religion onto the people who remained. Those who went south to avoid the invading Aryans were called the Dravidians. The British missionaries, even as early as 1840, went on to use this theory as a means to persuade people of South India to reject the Vedic tradition, since it had been forced on them by invaders, and accept Christianity. By using the typical "divide and rule" policy that the British were known for, they helped create a schism in the people of India which gave them better means to control and manipulate them under the guise of giving them back the respect they had always deserved. Of course, if they became Christian they would deserve even more respect, as portrayed by the missionaries. So, the Aryan Invasion Theory, which had originally been

developed by a Christian certainly continued to serve the Christian interests well, unbeknownst to the people who falsely accepted the Dravidian identity. In this regard, Chandrasekharendra Saraswati summed it up very nicely: "Their conclusions would permit them to regard the ancient rishis as primitive men inferior to the moderns... their analysis of our religious texts was motivated by the desire to show Christianity as a better religion."⁷

Thus, the real truth was kept hidden so their agenda could be served. But was not that the whole purpose behind the Aryan Invasion Theory from the start? After all, as N. S. Rajaram has succinctly related, "English translations of the *Rigveda*... represent a massive misinterpretation built on the preconception that the *Vedas* are the primitive poetry of the nomadic barbarians. Nothing could be further from the truth."⁸

Even of late, there have been leaders in Tamil Nadu who have promoted this Dravidian identity, and gave reasons why they should reject Hinduism, which is but an imposition on the natives. Of course, now, through the use of genetics, it has been proven that there never was any division, except in name only, between the Vedic Aryans and the native Dravidians. They were all part of the same native and indigenous fabric of ancient Indian civilization. Any other divisions were all but hypothetical and theory only. But this was part of the damage that such mental speculation had caused. And it still goes on. That is why books and information such as this needs to be spread, so that the truth of the matter can finally be displayed for all to see, and the unity to help preserve and protect the truth of the depth and profound nature of the Vedic civilization can be properly understood.

OBJECTIONS TO THE ARYAN INVASION THEORY

As archeologists B. B. Lal explains, it was Mortimer Wheeler who, after reporting a few skeletons being found at Mohenjodaro, said that the people of Mohenjodaro had been massacred in the invasion of the region. However, the skeletons had been found at different stratigraphic levels of the site—some from intermediate levels, late levels, and also from the deposits that had accumulated at the site after its desertion. This showed that Wheeler was wrong in his assessment. Recent skeletons would have been nowhere but the uppermost levels.

Thus, the conclusion would have to be that no evidence whatsoever of an invasion has been found at any of the hundreds of Harappan sites. Furthermore, at most of these sites, there is ample proof of continuity of habitation. An outside invasion also means the presence and entry of a new people, but no such evidence exists. A detailed study of human skeletal remains by Hemphill and his colleagues (1991) showed that no new people

arrived between 4500–800 BCE, during which the "Aryan invasion" was said to have happened (around 1500 BCE). Therefore, no evidence for an invasion exists, and certainly not by any Aryans.

Furthermore, when new invaders arrive, place names of some towns and rivers remain from the previous people who occupied the area. But no Dravidian names exists for any such objects in the entire area once occupied by the Harappans.⁹

Another point is that before the *Vedas* were written, it had been an oral tradition. However, an oral tradition of this kind of philosophy and culture cannot be maintained by a people in constant movement for decades if not centuries over many thousands of miles, which is what the Aryan Invasion Theory proposes. Such a tradition as the Vedic culture could be preserved only by a sedentary people where the older generation would have the necessary time to pass the communal lore to the younger generation.¹⁰

In fact, as we have established in *Proof of Vedic Culture's Global Existence*, the Vedic texts make no mention of any migration at all. Surely, if that had happened there would have been some narration of it, or history of a previous location. But nothing exists like that, nor any language previous to the Vedic culture that existed in the Gangetic plains as would be expected.

There are many reasons why common sense can tell you that there could not have been any invasion into Aryavrata (India) by Vedic Aryans from outside. The question is that if the Aryans were supposed to be rambling barbarians, as viewed by some, yet were able to develop such a sophisticated language (Sanskrit) and compositions (the *Vedas*), then how did they not leave in the countries they left behind a rich culture that shows their previous developments? What happened to their descendants who should have kept the remnants of their culture and language? Why were not similar developments made by those who remained in Eastern Europe? And what happened to the pre-Sanskrit language and culture of the area that the Aryans invaded, if that is what happened? No answers have been found regarding these points.

Furthermore, as Dr. B. B. Lal relates, "Let it be squarely stated that the earliest book of the Aryans, the *Rig Veda*, does not mention any of the species of cold-climate trees enumerated. On the other hand, all the trees mentioned in the *Rig Veda*, such as the *Ashvatha* (*Ficus religiosa* L.), *Khadira* (*Acacia catechu* Wild), *Nigrodhara* (*Ficus benghalensis* L.), do not belong to a cold climate but to a tropical one. Likewise, the *Rig Vedic* fauna, comprising such species as the lion, elephant, peacock, also belong to a tropical climate. Further, during the *Rig Vedic* period the *Sarasvati* was a mighty river, but it gradually dried up. The evidence of archeology, hydrology and radiocarbon dates shows that the *Sarasvati* dried up around 2000 BCE.

All this proves that the *Rig Veda* antedated the magic figure. Again, the *Rig Vedic* geography covers the area from the Ganga-Yamuna on the east to the west of the Indus. Likewise, the archeological evidence shows that prior to 2,000 BCE it was the Harappan Civilization that flourished in this region. Thus, the textual and archeological data combine to establish a perfect spatial-cum-chronological oneness between the *Rig Vedic* and Harappan cultures. And since, as demonstrated in this book, the Harappans were 'the sons of the soil', it squarely follows that the *Rig Vedic* people were indigenous.¹¹

We also need to understand from what frivolous basis came the term "Aryan race." The people who created this term, and the Aryan Invasion Theory itself, were not biologists, archeologists, or scientists, though some of them later adopted this. But they were only linguists of questionable qualifications. Even in 1929, Sir Julian Huxley, one of the great natural scientists of the twentieth century related (in *Oxford Pamphlet*, No. 5, OUP: p.9):

"In 1848, the young German scholar Friederich Max Muller (1823-1900) settled in Oxford... About 1853 he introduced into the English language the unlucky term *Aryan* as applied to a large group of languages.

"Moreover, Max Muller threw another apple of discord. He introduced a proposition that is demonstrably false. He spoke not only of a definite Aryan language and its descendants, but also of a corresponding 'Aryan race.' The idea was rapidly taken up both in Germany and in England."¹²

Part of the problem was a misinterpretation of the word *aryan*. With the AIT, it was meaning a race of people, or even a separate language. But the word *arya* was always meant to be used as an honorific title for someone who lead a pure life, who was on the path for attaining a pure and spiritual consciousness. *Arya* actually means clear as in light consciousness, not as a light-skinned person of another separate race. An *Aryan* in this case meant an ethical, social and spiritual ideal of a well-governed life, for someone who was noble, straightforward in his dealings, was courageous, gentle, kind, compassionate, protector of the weak, eager for knowledge, and displayed respect for the wise and learned. Thus, everything that was opposite of this, such as mean, cruel, rude, false, ignoble, was considered *non-aryan*.

Huxley, regarding the scientific view at the time (1939), said the following: "In England and America the phrase 'Aryan race' has quite ceased to be used by writers with scientific knowledge, though it appears occasionally in political and propagandist literature... In Germany, the idea of the 'Aryan race' received no more scientific support than in England. Nevertheless, it found able and very persistent literary advocates who made it appear very flattering to local vanity. It therefore steadily spread, fostered by special interests."

In this regard, N. S. Rajaram explains: "Those 'special conditions' were the rise of Nazism in Germany and British imperial interests in India. While both Germany and Britain took to the idea of the Aryan race, the courses taken by this racial theory in the two countries were quite different. Its perversion in Germany leading eventually to Nazism and its horrors is too well known to be repeated here. The British, however, put it to more creative use for imperial purposes, especially as a tool in making their rule acceptable to Indians. A BBC report admitted (6 October, 2005):

"It [AIT] gave a historical precedent to justify the role and status of the British Raj, who could argue that they were transforming India for the better in the same way that the Aryans had done thousands of years earlier."¹³

This was the way the British could justify their presence in India as a new and improved brand of Aryans that were doing the same thing that the present Indians who were the previous invading Aryans had done in the past. Thus, the Aryan Invasion Theory was perpetuated by special interests rather than by true historical evidence. In such a case, when the truth finally becomes apparent, such false notions have to dwindle and fade. That is why I have written about how those who believe in the false history of India are but a dying breed. The modern archeologists simply do not believe or see enough evidence to accept the Aryan Invasion Theory. Thus, it becomes self-evident that the Vedic culture was part of the indigenous tradition of India all along, and not brought to India by any outside invaders.

MISLEADING DATES OF THE ARYAN INVASION THEORY

When the idea for the Aryan invasion was developed by Max Muller, he was formulating dates based on his familiarity and loyalty to the Biblical tradition, which tries to establish that the world was created in 4004 BCE. Therefore, whatever dates he came up with had to fit into this scheme of things. So, as we know, he decided that the Aryans had to have invaded India in 1500 BCE, and then developed the *Rig Veda* thereafter in 1200 BCE. This means that such calculations are based on faith in the Bible, and, accordingly, a group of linguistically unified people must have been existing around the Caspian Sea before invading India. It is this Biblical reference that formed the foundation of these dates of Max Muller's for the Aryan Invasion Theory and when the *Rig Veda* may have been written. These were merely assumptions, many of which have been left uncontested, especially outside of India, up until a few decades ago.

Furthermore, Dr. Narahari Achar, a physicist from the University of Memphis clearly showed with astronomical analysis that the *Mahabharata* War took place in 3067 BCE, seriously challenging the

outside "Aryan" origin of Vedic people.¹⁴ Therefore, if we accept the year 3102 BCE as the date for the beginning of Kali-yuga, and 3067 BCE as the time for the *Mahabharata* war, this surely means that human society itself had been in existence for many, many years before the Christian date of 4004 BCE as the date for the creation of the world. This would make the 4004 BCE date of creation and the stories that go with it complete fiction.

The real problem with this is that these dates of 1500 BCE for the invasion of the Aryan forces and 1200 BCE for the creation of the *Rig Veda* have been propagated in both school and college books for many years as if they are the substantiated truth. However, even Muller admitted many times later in his life that these dates were arbitrary in nature, or merely guesses grounded on his own view of things, which were precarious opinions based on his allegiance to the Bible. He had written in admission, "I need hardly say that I agree with everyone of my critics. I have repeatedly dwelt on the entirely hypothetical character of the dates that I venture to assign [to the Vedic literature]. ... Whether the Vedic hymns were composed 1000, 1500 or 2000 or 3000 BC, no power on earth will ever determine."

As we have seen, it is the findings in archeology and the statements and history within the *Rig Veda* that have contradicted the dates of the fictional Aryan Invasion and the idea of an invasion itself. For example, the *Rig Veda* has described the ancient and glorious Sarasvati River, which is known to have dried up around 1900 BCE, and was probably already in the process of drying up back in 3000 BCE. This could not have been written by any invaders who entered India around 1500 BCE. How could they have described worshiping a river that had already ceased to exist 500 hundred years earlier? This is impossible. It would be like a haunting ghost story, still talking about things that had disappeared many generations ago.

This indicates that the *Rig Veda* had to have been in existence while the Sarasvati River was in her prime. This also means that the dates that many Western scholars have assigned for the formation of the *Rig Veda* are also in error by probably 2000 years or more. Of course, it was Max Muller who was paid by the British Government to write a negative interpretation of the Vedas to undermine the view Hindus themselves had for their own scripture, so he may have also been under pressure for his employment if he did not provide such viewpoints. Nonetheless, he had his own ambitions, as was outlined in a letter to his wife in 1866 about his edition of the *Rig Veda* having "a great extent on the fate of India and the growth of millions of souls in that country. It is the root of their religion and to show them what that root is, I feel sure, is the only way of uprooting all that has sprung from it in the last three thousand years."

Well, his purpose did not work, but certainly created a major distraction in finding the truth of the matter, which, fortunately, there have been many scholars that have now shown the inaccuracy of the views that had originated from Max Muller's hypothesis and guesswork.

THE SARASVATI RIVER IN THE RIG VEDA

The Sarasvati River is mentioned in the *Rig Veda* over 60 times, with three hymns that make Sarasvati the subject, namely in book 6, hymn 61, and book 7, hymns 95 & 96. The most noted verse from the *Rig Veda* that refers to the mighty Sarasvati river and its civilization is 7.95.1.1-2, which states:

*pra kshodasa dhayada sasra
esha sarasvati dharunamayasi puh
prababadhana rathyeva yati
vishva apo mahina sindhuranyaha*

"Pure in her course from the mountains to the ocean, alone of streams Sarasvati hath listened."

Thus, it stands to reason that the Sarasvati acquired this state of reverence during its prime and not after it started drying up. In other verses that describe her, we find it said in the *Rig Veda* (7.36.6) she is the holiest and greatest of all rivers, the best of the seven rivers, and Mother of the rivers and the Sindhu River. Then again she is the best of the seven rivers (6.61.9-10), and is fed by three, five or seven streams (6.61.12), and nourishes all of the Vedic people, and flows through the mountains and crushes boulders like the stems of lotus flowers (6.61.2), and that Sarasvati was the best of mothers, the best river and best goddess (6.41.16).

For further insight into this, we can see how the *Rig Veda* described the Sarasvati River. Some of the Sanskrit words used to describe the Sarasvati in the *Rig Veda* are *naditama*, *ambitama*, and *devitama*, which mean best river, best mother and best goddess (2.41.16); it is swollen and fed by three or more rivers *pinvamana sindhubhiih* (6.52.6); it is endless, swift moving, roaring, most dear among her sister rivers; together with her divine aspect, it nourishes the tribes (6.61.8-13). In 7.95.2 it is said *giribhyah a samudrat*, it flows in a pure course from the mountains to the ocean. Then 7.96.2 and 10.177 mentions to pray to the river goddess for sustenance and good fortune, and 10.64.9 calls upon her (and Sarayu and Indus) as great and nourishing. Thus, the descriptions indicate a live and flowing river of great importance, flowing from the Himalayas to the ocean.¹⁵

The *Rig Veda* (10.75.5) also indicates where the Sarasvati was located by listing the main northern rivers in order from the east, in which case places the Sarasvati between the Yamuna and the Shutudri (modern Sutlej), as found in the verse:

*imam me gange yamune sarasvati shutudri stomam parushnya
asiknya marudvridhe vitasta arjikiye shrinuhya sushomaya*

"Ganga, Yamuna, Sarasvati, Shutudri (Sutlej) Parushni (Ravi) Asikni, Manuvridha, Vitasta, Arjikiye, Shrinuhya, and Sushomaya."

Many great Vedic rishis were also mentioned in the *Rig Veda* as having a connection with the Sarasvati River, such as Vasistha and Jamadagni (7.96.3), Gritsamada (2.41.16), and Bharadvaj (6.61). Also kings like Divodas (6.61) and Bharatas such as Devavat and Devashravas (3.23) are mentioned in connection with the Sarasvati. Also of the *Rig Veda* are the clan of the Purus who resided along the Sarasvati, in which it says, "Sarasvati, on both whose plant-laden banks the Purus dwell." (7.96.2)¹⁶

The importance of the Sarasvati, as herein demonstrated, cannot go unnoticed. Besides references to the Sarasvati River in the *Rig Veda*, we can find some in the *Atharva Veda* as well. One reference (6.30.1) refers to Indra ploughing the banks of the Sarasvati to cultivate barley, which was not only one of the items for offering into the fire during the *yajna* ritual, but was also one of the earliest staple foods.

During sacrifices, we find (AV 5.27.9) Sarasvati as the goddess was invoked along with goddesses Ida, Mahi and Bharathi. Then in hymns (AV 7.68 and 18.1.41) she is called to accept oblations during the ritual. We also find (AV 7.57.1) where Vamadeva was shaken due to the apathy and derogatory words of the people, and invokes Sarasvati to reduce tension and cleanse the mind. In a similar way, we find (AV19.40.1) where Sarasvati is praised in order to overcome frailties of the mind.

PROOF OF THE SARASVATI RIVER

While surveying the course of the Sarasvati River, geologist Sir Auriel Stein (1862-1943) concluded that there was indeed such a river that had dried up when the course of the Sutlej changed, and discontinued being the main contributory of the Sarasvati River. Thus, as the Sarasvati began to dry, the cities and residents that depended on the river also had to move. With the satellite images made through earth sensing satellites from 1978 by NASA (National Aeronautics and Space Administration) and the ISRO (Indian Space Research Organization) that revealed the ancient river courses, these show

that the Sarasvati was a channel that ranged from six to eight kilometers wide, and up to 14 kilometers in some parts. Thus, the greatness of the Sarasvati River, as described in the *Rig Veda*, was verified.

This was further confirmed by an aerial survey conducted by the American Landsat satellite in 1990 that showed a dried tract of 1000 miles where the Sarasvati would have flowed from the Himalayas to the Sourashtrian coast. This changed the way many researchers viewed this issue. This was later followed up in 1996 by the Indian remote sensing satellite of the Indian Space Research Organization, the color images of which also clearly showed marks of a palaeochannel as wide as 3 km to 12 km in the same stretch.

Furthermore, in 1998, there were 24 wells dug by the Central Ground Water Commission along the dry bed, all of which produced potable water but one. Also in 1998, after the Pokhran atomic test, the Baba Atomic Research Center (BARC) drilled down 70 meters for sub-soil water to confirm that the aquifers had not been affected by radioactive material and found that the water was of Himalayan origin from as far back as 14,000 years.

This discovery of the Sarasvati also solved the reason why there were alluvial deposits in the Gulf of Cambay, discovered in 1869 by archeologist Alex Rogue. It was odd because there was no known river that flowed from the Himalayas at the time.¹⁷

THE DEMISE OF THE SARASVATI

The *Rig Veda* describes the Sarasvati River as a mighty flowing river. So if we know that it dried up completely around 2000 BCE, and had to have been in the process of drying by 3000 BCE or before, then the *Rig Veda* had to have been written before it started to dry up. There is nothing in the *Rig Veda* about the Sarasvati diminishing in any way. However, we do find in the *Mahabharata* where the Sarasvati was decreasing to a shorter course, such as in 3.130.3; 6.7.47; 6.37.1-4; 9.34.81; and 9.36.1-2.

The *Mahabharata* (*Shalya Parva*, 36-55) also describes the Sarasvati in relation to Balarama's pilgrimage, which He took to occupy Himself rather than participate in the war at Kurukshetra with His brother Lord Krishna. It states that the Sarasvati was still significant in its holiness, but from its origin it flowed only for a forty-day journey by horse into the desert where it disappeared. All that was left were the holy places that used to be on its banks (as also mentioned in 3.80.84; 3.88.2; & 9.34.15-8).

The *Mahabharata* also describes the geographical location of the river, saying that it flows near Kurukshetra (3.81.125). Similar information along with the

place where the Sarasvati disappears, Vinashana, is found in the *Manusamhita* (2.21).

All of this also indicates that the *Rig Veda* had to have existed well before 2000 BCE because it is described therein that the Sarasvati was a mighty flowing river during the *Rig Vedic* times, before it finally dried in 2000 BCE. According to the *Rig Veda* (10.75.5-6), the Vedic people occupied the area from the Ganga in the east to the Indus in the west. And as we have established in *Proof of Vedic Culture's Global Existence*, the Harappan civilization was a part of the Vedic culture in the form of its continuance and diversity, or regional variations. In fact, the *Rig Veda* was already in existence before the Harappan Civilization came into its prime.

From other research we have found that the whole of the Sarasvati River had dried by about 2000 to 1800 BCE, and was at best a few small lakes. But the site of the Harappan Civilization called Kalibangan, that sits along the bank of the Sarasvati, after hydrological investigations (Raikes 1968), reveals that it was abandoned because of the drying up of the river. And this happened because of the rise of the Bata-Markanda Terrace in the Himalayas (Puri and Verma 1998). Even the *Panchavimsha Brahmana* (15.10.16) mentions the drying up of the Sarasvati. Radiocarbon dates also show that Kalibangan was abandoned around 2000 BCE.¹⁸

Research explains that the demise of the Sarasvati River was caused by the lack of water it had previously received from the Yamuna, which had changed its course to flow eastward into the Ganga. Then the Sutlej also turned southwest, while the glacial melt also decreased, all of which greatly weakened the flow of the Sarasvati. This resulted in the Sarasvati disappearing into the desert at a place called Vinashana, or Samanta-panchaka in the *Mahabharata*, before it reached the sea.¹⁹

This, along with the world drought that was known to have happened around 2200 to 1900 BCE, contributed to drying up the Sarasvati and Drishavati rivers and to the disappearance of the Harappan or Indus Valley Civilization. It also created the Thar desert. After this many people were forced to abandon this area and whatever towns and cities flourished there at that time. This massive worldwide drought not only impacted the Harappan civilization, but is also known to have affected or ended the civilizations of not only Egypt, but also of the Sumer-Akkad regions in Mesopotamia. All of this caused a deterioration of the Vedic bond in this area, and a rise in small political groups known as Janapadas, which is described in the Buddhist and Jain literature. Sanskrit also lost influence while Prakrits, regional languages, like Pali and Ardhamagadhi were used, as we find in the Buddhist and Jain texts of that era.

As further explained by N.S. Rajaram, it was sometime around 3000 BCE when the Yamuna River changed its course and started its flow into the Ganga River. This may have been due to earthquakes or something similar. That, of course, weakened the flow of the Sarasvati River, wherein it soon disappeared into the desert at a place called Vinashana. Some archeologists have identified this place as Kalibangan in Rajasthan, which is also where Harappan and pre-Harappan settlements have been found, as well as signs of possible earthquakes in the area. This corresponds to descriptions found in the *Jaiminiya Brahmana* and the *Mahabharata*.

The lower part of the Sarasvati River was still fed by the Sutlej and other rivers for some time, which continued to flow through the Thar desert and support some of the Harappan settlements in Rajasthan, Sindh and Cholistan to the Rann of Kutch. However, the Sutlej later also changed course, so this stretch of the river also dried up in stages from 2200 to 1900, when it is known to have disappeared completely, putting an end to whatever was left of the Harappan society in that area. This means that the Harappan civilization came to an end by natural causes, not any invaders, and then moved farther east into the Gangetic plains. Some Harappan people may have also moved westward into West Asia where they contributed to the growing tribes there. Some of the Kassite rulers seemed to have been of Indian origin who established an empire there.

Since Mohenjodaro and Harappa were first discovered in 1922, numerous other settlements have been uncovered, which now number over 2500, which stretches from Baluchistan to the Ganga and beyond, and down to the Tapti Valley. All of this covers nearly a million and a half square miles, all of which have been researched by archeologists. And 75% of all of these are concentrated around the dried up Sarasvati River bed. However, this also means that it was not an invasion that forced the abandonment of these towns and cities, but it was the drying up of the Sarasvati River, which was a catastrophe that lead to an outflow of people going in different directions from here to resettle elsewhere, especially into the Gangetic plain, but also including westward into Iran, Mesopotamia and other areas.

Even a most recent study, as reported in *The Daily Mail* in London, combining the latest archaeological evidence with state-of-the-art geoscience technologies provides evidence that climate change was a key ingredient in the collapse of the great Indus or Harappan Civilization almost 4000 years ago.

Liviu Giosan, a geologist with Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution (WHOI) and lead author of the study published the week of May 28, 2012, in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, "We reconstructed the dynamic landscape of the plain where the Indus civilization developed 5200

years ago, built its cities, and slowly disintegrated between 3900 and 3000 years ago. Until now, speculations abounded about the links between this mysterious ancient culture and its life-giving mighty rivers... We considered that it is high time for a team of interdisciplinary scientists to contribute to the debate about the enigmatic fate of these people," Giosan explained.

As the report related, the research was conducted between 2003 and 2008 in Pakistan, from the coast of the Arabian Sea into the fertile irrigated valleys of Punjab and the northern Thar Desert. The international team included scientists from the U.S., U.K., Pakistan, India, and Romania with specialties in geology, geomorphology, archaeology, and mathematics. By combining satellite photos and topographic data collected by the Shuttle Radar Topography Mission (SRTM), the researchers prepared and analyzed digital maps of landforms constructed by the Indus and neighboring rivers, which were then probed in the field by drilling, coring, and even manually-dug trenches. Collected samples were used to determine the sediments' origins, whether brought in and shaped by rivers or wind, and their age, in order to develop a chronology of landscape changes.

The new study suggests the same conclusions as had previously been arrived at by other researchers, that the decline in monsoon rains led to weakened river dynamics, and played a critical role both in the development and the collapse of the Harappan culture, which relied on river floods to fuel their agricultural surpluses.

From the new research, a compelling picture of 10,000 years of changing landscapes emerges. Before the plain was massively settled, the wild and forceful Indus and its tributaries flowing from the Himalaya cut valleys into their own deposits and left high "interfluvial" stretches of land between them. In the east, reliable monsoon rains sustained perennial rivers that crisscrossed the desert leaving behind their sedimentary deposits across a broad region.

The new research argues that the Sarasvati (Ghaggar-Hakra) was primarily a perennial monsoon-supported watercourse, and that aridification reduced it to short seasonal flows. Therefore, the conclusion of their research, in this regard, is that the slow drying of the Sarasvati River was the primary reason for the movement of the Indus Valley Civilization from the region, not invaders who took over the area. By 3900 years ago, their rivers drying, the Harappans had an escape route to the east toward the Ganges basin, where monsoon rains remained reliable.²⁰

LOCATION OF VINASHANA

nature of India's timeless Dharmic tradition, and its advancements, which were already in existence before the credits of its wonders were attempted to be taken by outsiders.

CHAPTER NOTES

1. G. P. Singh, *Facets of Ancient Indian History and Culture*.
2. David Frawley, *The Myth of the Aryan Invasion of India*, Voice of India, New Delhi, 2002, p. 43.
3. Bal Ram Singh, Editor, *Origin of Indian Civilization*, Center for Indic Studies, Dartmouth, USA, 2010, p. 15.
4. B. B. Lal, *Origin of Indian Civilization*, Edited by Bal Ram Singh, Center for Indic Studies, Dartmouth, USA, 2010. p. 23-24.
5. Ibid., p. 24.
6. Max Muller, *Biographies of Words and the Home of the Aryas*, by London, 1888, p. 120.
7. Chandrasekharendra Saraswati, *The Vedas*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1988, p. 16.
8. N. S. Rajaram, *The Politics of History*, Voice of India, New Delhi, 1995, p. xvi.
9. B. B. Lal, *Origin of Indian Civilization*, Edited by Bal Ram Singh, Center for Indic Studies, Dartmouth, USA, 2010. p. 26.
10. Kazanas, *Origin of Indian Civilization*, Edited by Bal Ram Singh, Center for Indic Studies, Dartmouth, USA, 2010, p. 57.
11. B. B. Lal, *The Home land of the Aryans, Evidence of Rig Vedic Flora and Fauna and Archeology*, Aryan Books International, Delhi, pp. 85-88.
12. N. S. Rajaram, *Origin of Indian Civilization*, Edited by Bal Ram Singh, Center for Indic Studies, Dartmouth, USA, 2010, p. 166-67.
13. Ibid., p. 167.
14. *Origin of Indian Civilization*, Edited by Bal Ram Singh, Center for Indic Studies, Dartmouth, USA, 2010, p. 17.
15. Kazanas, *Origin of Indian Civilization*, Edited by Bal Ram Singh, Center for Indic Studies, Dartmouth, USA, 2010, p. 54.
16. Dr. David Frawley and Dr. Navaratna S. Rajaram, *Hidden Horizons, Unearthing 10,000 Years of Indian Culture*, Swaminarayan Aksharpith, Ahmedabad, India, 2006, p. 64-65.
17. *Pride of India: A Glimpse into India's Scientific Heritage*, Samskriti Bharati, New Delhi, 2006, p. 78-79.
18. B. B. Lal, *Origin of Indian Civilization*, Edited by Bal Ram Singh, Center for Indic Studies, Dartmouth, USA, 2010, p. 34.

19. Dr. David Frawley and Dr. Navaratna S. Rajaram, *Hidden Horizons, Unearthing 10,000 Years of Indian Culture*, Swaminarayan Aksharpith, Ahmedabad, India, 2006, p70-71)
20. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-2151143/Climate-change-wiped-worlds-great-civilisations-4-000-years-ago.html>.
21. C. Rayachaudhuri, *Studies in Indian Antiquities*, Calcutta, 1958, p. 134.
22. Dr. Ravi Prakash Arya, *New Discoveries About Vedic Sarasvati*, Indian Foundation for Vedic Science, Rohtak, Haryana, India, 2005, p. 26.
23. N. Jha and N. S. Rajaram, *The Deciphered Indus Script*, Aditya Prakashan, New Delhi, 2000, p. 162.
24. Dr. David Frawley and Dr. Navaratna S. Rajaram, *Hidden Horizons, Unearthing 10,000 Years of Indian Culture*, Swaminarayan Aksharpith, Ahmedabad, India, 2006, p.106.
25. B. B. Lal, *Homeland of the Aryans: Evidence of Rig Vedic Flora and Fauna and Archaeology*, pp. 80-81.
26. Sir John Marshall, *Mohenjo-Daro and the Indus Civilization*, Vol. II, p. 654.
27. Edwin Bryant, *The Quest for the Origins of Vedic Culture*, Oxford University Press, 2001, p. 170-171.
28. B. B. Lal, *Colonialism, Nationalism, Ethnicity, and Archaeology*, Parts 1 and 2, *Review of Archaeology* 18, no. 2:1-14 and 35-47, 1997, p. 285.
29. S. P. Gupta, *The Indus Sarasvati Civilization*, Pratibha Prakashan, 1996, p. 147.
30. N. Jha and N. S. Rajaram, *The Deciphered Indus Script*, Aditya Prakashan, New Delhi, 2000, p. 31.
31. Chandrakant Panse, *DNA, Genetics and Population Dynamics: Debunking the Aryan Invasion Propaganda*, Professor of Biotechnology, Newton, Massachusetts. Paper presented at the Third Annual Human Empowerment Conference at Houston, Texas, September, 2005.
32. <http://www.thehindu.com/2006/06/24/stories/2006062412870400.htm>.
33. N. S. Rajaram, *Origin of Indian Civilization*, Edited by Bal Ram Singh, Center for Indic Studies, Dartmouth, USA, 2010, p. 171.
34. Ibid., p. 173.
35. Stephen Oppenheimer, *Out of Eden: The Peopling of the World*, Constable, London, 2003, p. 152.
36. Stephen Oppenheimer, *The Real Eve: Modern Man's Journey Out of Africa*, Carroll & Graf, 2003, p. 152.
37. Nicholas Kazanas, *Indo-Aryan Origins and Other Vedic Issues*, Aditya Prakashan, New Delhi, 2009, p. 62-3.
38. A. B. Keith, *The Age of the Rigveda*, Cambridge History of India, Vol. I, 1922, pp. 77-113.

39. Nicholas Kazanas, *Indo-Aryan Origins and Other Vedic Issues*, Aditya Prakashan, New Delhi, 2009. p. 9.
40. Nicholas Kazanas, *Indo-Aryan Origins and Other Vedic Issues*, Aditya Prakashan, New Delhi, 2009, p. 10-11.
41. Ibid., p. 243.
42. Shri Aurobindo, *The Secret of the Veda*, Shri Aurobindo Ashram, Pondicherry, 1971, p. 24.
43. Jim Shaffer, *The Indo-Aryan Invasions: Cultural Myth and Archaeological Reality* (in *The People of South Asia*, 77-90. Ed. John Lukacs, Plenum Press, New York, 1984, p. 88.
44. Nicholas Kazanas, *Indo-Aryan Origins and Other Vedic Issues*, by Aditya Prakashan, New Delhi, 2009, p. 302.
45. Ibid., p. 328.